



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/481,840	01/12/2000	Michael Robert Hanson	04860.P1712C	6190

7590 11/23/2001
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman
12400 Wilshire Blvd
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

YANG, GRANT C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 11/23/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

T.R

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/481,840	HANSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Grant C Yang	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2000.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 14-37 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 14-37 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 1/12/2000 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the references that are crossed out do not have the date of publication. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 ¶ C(1).

Specification

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it does not clearly describe the invention as disclosed in the claims. The current abstract describes the invention of the parent application; however, clearly as the applicant found a need to change the title to reflect the claims, the same logic follows to change the Abstract. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "810" has been used to designate both "Client" and "World Wide Web". This occurs on page 6, line 10, of the Specification, where clients is referred to as "810 and 820" when it should be "800 and 820." Correction is required.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description:

904. Correction is required.

5. Applicant is required to submit a proposed drawing correction in reply to this Office action. However, formal correction of the noted defect can be deferred until the application is allowed by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 14-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adobe PageMill, Version 2.0, released April 22, 1996.

Regarding independent claim 14, Adobe discloses:

- a palette window comprising “defined objects” such as the **Finder Window** or **Pasteboard** found on page 71,
- an “objects panel” with a list of objects, such as the **toolbar**, defined on page 10,
- a “view window” that can view the objects on the page viewed through **edit mode** or **preview mode**, as explained on page 48,

- an “input device” for selecting an object, such as a mouse used in **Drag and Drop** operations, as on page 5 where a user can drag and drop colors, or for **clicking on a tab**, as on page 80 or 82.

Adobe does not expressly disclose that the object and user windows are in the same palette window; however, Adobe does disclose combining many feature related to objects in a general **inspector window**, as defined on page 49.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to put the object window and user defined window together into Adobe’s **inspector window**. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because collating the objects related to a page makes editing the objects and placing objects onto the page a more organized process.

Regarding dependent claim 15, Adobe discloses a “user defined object panel” such as the special pictures in the **Finder** window, or the pictures pasted to the **Pasteboard** that can be dragged into the page, as in the example image on page 71.

Regarding dependent claim 16, Adobe discloses an “object panel” with “predefined objects,” such as a **toolbar** that has a **Horizontal Rule button** on the toolbar, as defined on page 87.

Regarding dependent claim 17, Adobe discloses using a “mouse” as an “input device” because it is needed in order to use **Dragging and dropping**, as described on page 2, under System requirements.

Regarding dependent claim 18, Adobe discloses using a “keyboard” as an “input device” because it is needed in order to use the **keyboard shortcuts**, as described on page 169, Appendix C: Keyboard Shortcuts.

Regarding dependent claim 19, Adobe discloses an “object editor window” that displays a list of properties of an object, as shown in the image on page 80, where an **object panel** has a list of properties, such as the width, height, label, border, behavior, and an alternate label, for the object, which in the example is an image.

Regarding independent claim 20, Adobe discloses a computer mediated method of displaying a collection of objects, as Adobe is a computer program, similar to that of claim 14 above, and furthermore, also displaying a “collection of objects” in a page in a view window, as shown in the example figure on page 96.

Regarding dependent claim 21, Adobe discloses “object panel” with “defined objects,” such as **a toolbar** that has a **Horizontal Rule button** on the toolbar, and where the user can **Click the Insert Horizontal Rule button on the toolbar** in order to insert the object into the page, as described on page 87, under Adding horizontal rules.

Regarding dependent claim 22, Adobe discloses a palette window comprising “defined objects” in the **Finder Window** or **Pasteboard** found on page 71.

Adobe does not expressly disclose that the user window is in the “palette window” with other object panels; however, Adobe does disclose combining many feature related to objects in a general **inspector window**, as defined on page 49.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to put the user window with other object panels into

Adobe's **inspector window**. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because collating the objects related to a page makes editing the objects and placing objects onto the page a more organized process.

Regarding dependent claim 23, Adobe discloses "objects panel" with a list of objects, such as the **toolbar**, defined on page 10.

Adobe does not expressly disclose that the object window is in the "palette window" with other object panels; however, Adobe does disclose combining many feature related to objects in a general **inspector window**, as defined on page 49.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to put the object window and other object panels into Adobe's **inspector window**. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because collating the objects related to a page makes editing the objects and placing objects onto the page a more organized process.

Dependent claim 24 reads similarly to and is a combination of the user defined objects and predefined objects in the palette windows and is rejected similarly to claims 22 and 23 above.

Regarding dependent claim 25, Adobe discloses "receiving input to select an object to modify" as described on page 84, under To add or remove an image border, when a user **selects the image**. Furthermore, Adobe discloses, displaying in an object editor window a property of the object, as on page 84, under To add or remove an image border, where the **Object Panel** of the **Inspector Palette** lists several different properties of the example image to be edited. Furthermore, Adobe discloses "receiving

input to modify the value of the property associated with the object,” and on page 84, under To add or remove an image border, the examples shows that to remove a border a user can **type 0 to remove an existing border.**

Regarding dependent claim 26, Adobe discloses receiving input to select a defined object, as shown on the figure on page 71, where an object, such as an Image, can be dragged and dropped into the view page.

Regarding dependent claim 27, Adobe discloses selecting an object that has properties identical to an object, and displaying that object in the defined objects panel, as described on page 72, where an image may be dragged from the **window to the Pasteboard.**

Regarding dependent claim 28, Adobe discloses selecting an object, which must be done through clicking on the object in the window, as described on page 84, with the example of selecting an image. Adobe further discloses selecting this image on the view page or “view window” in order to edit the properties of the device, as is seen on page 84.

Regarding dependent claim 29, Adobe discloses modifying a value of a property of an object and displaying the object in the page, as described on page 84, where the value is changed on the border from 5 to 0 through a keyboard input, and this change is reflected on the image of the page.

Regarding dependent claim 30, Adobe discloses the method of dragging and dropping the **images** from the **pasteboard** as described on page 72, under To add an image, movie, or sound to PageMill using the Pasteboard.

Regarding independent claim 31, Adobe discloses a computer usable medium having computer readable program code, as PageMill is a computer program, to display defined objects, receiving input, and display objects in a view window, similar to claim 20 above, and is rejected similarly to claim 20 above.

Regarding dependent claim 32, Adobe discloses predefined objects, such as the **toolbar**, defined on page 10, as well as "defined objects" in the **Finder Window** or **Pasteboard** found on page 71.

Adobe does not expressly disclose that the defined objects panel and user defined objects panel are in the same palette window; however, Adobe does disclose combining many feature related to objects in a general **inspector window**, as defined on page 49.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to put the defined objects panel and user defined objects panel together into Adobe's **inspector window**. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because collating the objects related to a page makes editing the objects and placing objects onto the page a more organized process.

Regarding dependent claim 33, the computer program code is disclosed by Adobe as the program PageMill, and furthermore, the different object panels and listed objects are rejected similarly to claim 23 above.

Regarding dependent claim 34, the computer program code is disclosed by Adobe as the program PageMill, and furthermore, the different object panels and listed objects are rejected similarly to claim 24 above.

Regarding dependent claim 35, the computer program code is disclosed by Adobe as the program PageMill, and furthermore, the code to selecting an object to modify a property, display an object editor window, and receiving input to modify the property, is similarly rejected to claim 25 above.

Regarding dependent claim 36, the computer program code is disclosed by Adobe as the program PageMill, and furthermore, the code to modify a property and select an object from the palette window, is rejected similarly to claim 26 above.

Regarding dependent claim 37, the computer program code is disclosed by Adobe as the program PageMill, and furthermore, the code to receive input selecting an object, having a property associated with the object, and displaying the object in a defined objects panel, is rejected similarly to claim 27 above.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S. Patent No. 6,202,073 B1	Takahashi
U.S. Patent No. 6,081,817	Taguchi
U.S. Patent No. 5,903,905	Anderson et al.
U.S. Patent No. 4,506,343	Shipp, Jr. et al.
U.S. Patent No. 5,802,530	Van Hoff
U.S. Patent No. 5,761,673	Bookman et al.
U.S. Patent No. 5,911,145	Arora et al.
U.S. Patent No. 5,845,299	Arora et al.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grant C Yang whose telephone number is 703-305-1828. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30am-6pm) every other Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

November 16, 2001


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100